



I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail No. EV670649916US, in an envelope addressed to: MS Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Dated: October 11, 2005

Signature:


Sandy Reisman

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: **STEVE BECK ET AL.**

APPLICATION No.: **09/721,441**

FILED: **NOVEMBER 22, 2000**

FOR: **DYNAMICALLY TARGETING ONLINE
ADVERTISING MESSAGES TO USERS**

EXAMINER: **J. D. CARLSON**

ART UNIT: **3622**

CONF. NO: **2327**

Reply Brief

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

*rely brief
noted ge
12/22/05*

Sir:

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.41

This reply brief is in response to the Examiner's Answer dated August 11, 2005.

I. REPLY TO ANSWER

A. Reply to Examiner's answer concerning claim 15 and 30

On page 10 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner states the following:

Applicant argues that none teach a first satisfied condition. The conditions are applied sequentially and any TRUE condition would trigger a random subgroup ad; this would occur for the first TRUE condition.

Appellants respectfully disagree. Claim 15 recites "a treatment subgroup" that indicates "which of a plurality of advertising treatments will be applied when the condition is the first condition in the sequence of conditions to be satisfied." Similarly, claim 30 recites